

THE SANCTITY OF LIFE AND OTHER REMEMBRANCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, a few important items by way of a kind of a weekend or the end of week on the get-away Thursday cleanup of some things that I think bear mentioning for us all to think about over the weekend.

If I were going to put a title for our Official Reporters of Debates on this, I think I would call it The Sanctity of Life and Other Remembrances.

Under the other remembrances, today, it is moved on the wire services that San Francisco is going to establish sister city status with Ho Chi Minh City. Some day, Ho Chi Minh City under a free Vietnam will be renamed Saigon, its traditional name.

Just a Stalingrad, the scene of Russia's great turnaround battle, the U.S.S.R.'s great battle, in spite of the history attached to the siege of Stalingrad and their victory, which began the rollback of Nazism but the continued growth of communism, in spite of that traditional city's title, it was changed after communism fell back to Volgograd.

The greatest change of all, since there are still American professors in our colleges apologizing for Karl Marx and still for Lenin, Leningrad is changed back to its traditional title, was a particularly joyful day, because now we refer to it with a Christian title, Petrograd or St. Petersburg.

Actually, St. Petersburg is what used to be called Leningrad, the second largest city in Russia, and was the second largest city when it was 15 so-called states under the USSR.

I think San Francisco still has a lot to learn. I do not know if they are still a nuclear-free zone, but it is tragic to take the city named after the gentle Saint Francis of Assisi and have sisterhood with a communist regime still run out of Hanoi that caused the death of 700,000 boat people on the high seas, that executed by death lists 68,000 people at a minimum, including secretaries who had trusted us and merely worked for us in that decade that we were trying to do for South Vietnam, south of the 17th parallel, what we had done for Korea south of the 38th parallel. And that was to give it, however imperfect, a free system, certainly freer than the communist tyranny that is still there.

After the Hanoi government, the conquerors of Saigon, the renamers of Ho Chi Minh City, after the way they have psychologically tortured our POW's and missing-in-action families over the last three decades, it is incomprehensible that San Francisco would do this.

But they picked a great day to do it all right. Not great. Today is the 23rd anniversary of an invasion across the DMZ on March 30, 1972, with Russian-supplied PT-76 amphibious tanks, armored vehicles.

They came across the DMZ. They were smashed back, but it was a precursor for the roll-up of the whole of South Vietnam that started 20 years ago this month and ended with the fall in the adjoining country of Phnom Penh, which at the time had a U.N. seat, still does, the fall of Phnom Penh on the eve of the 230th anniversary of our Paul Revere Ride to freedom on the 17th of April. Phnom Penh, Cambodia, fell with great loss of life, and the killing fields and the Khmer Rouge communist holocaust began.

Vietnam ended 20 years ago on the 30th of April. That 20th anniversary is coming up. The next day, we have the tragic vote in this Chamber. It was a year and a half before I got here or I would have weighed in on the debate. We turned our back on the evacuation money to save those people in South Vietnam who were not corrupt and that was the majority who didn't understand what communism was and what freedom was.

□ 1645

So San Francisco continues to insult the 48,000 plus names on the wall, 47,600 that died in combat, and as one of the soldiers of that period said, the beat goes on. As a matter of fact, that was Congressman SONNY BONO's written song.

Then there are two other items on front page stories in the great Washington Times yesterday and today, today's story quoted me. Listen to this, Mr. Speaker, and the 1.3 million people watching this Chamber on C-SPAN.

Yesterday in a breakthrough story, it was uncovered that the training programs for Federal employees on AIDS were really a masking of pro-homosexual programs.

I will submit those two headlines and I will also submit an AP story, Mr. Speaker, on what I had predicted night before last, that the Pope's encyclical on the sanctity of life called *Evangelium Vitae*, the Gospel of Life, is as powerful as I thought. It is the hammer coming down on politicians who think they can escape voting conscience on all issues that involve abortion, euthanasia or this Frankenstein testing on embryos, and fetal experimentation.

The articles referred to are as follows:

[From the Washington Times, Mar. 30, 1995]
CLASSES ON AIDS UNDER FIRE—HILL PROBE
SOUGHT OF 'PRO-GAY' SLANT
(By Rowan Scarborough)

At least two congressional panels plan to investigate the Clinton administration's mandatory AIDS education for federal employees in light of reports that the curriculum promotes the homosexual lifestyle.

Rep. Robert K. Dornan, California Republican and chairman of the House National Security subcommittee on personnel, said he will hold hearings later this year.

"I'm going to go on the House floor to beg federal workers of courage to come to me anonymously and help me build a case file," Mr. Dornan said. "It's not AIDS education. It is advancing the homosexual agenda. The homosexual has cleverly used a venereal dis-

ease, and they used it brilliantly to their advantage to promote the homosexual cause."

The House Government Reform and Oversight subcommittee on civil service has begun a preliminary inquiry, a staffer said.

"These are things that really don't belong as mandatory training and have nothing to do with AIDS in the workplace," the staffer said.

House Speaker Newt Gingrich of Georgia may take a look at the program after the "Contract with America" is completed, said his spokesman, Tony Blankley.

"It sounds like the typical hideous things that liberals do," Mr. Blankley said.

But the White House defended the program, which was targeted to reach 2 million federal employees and is due to end in the coming days. President Clinton signed an executive order creating the program in September 1993.

"It went very well and was very positively received," said Richard Sorian, spokesman for the White House National AIDS Policy office, which coordinated the far-reaching network of "training-the-trainer" sessions and education. "There's been very good feedback from employees. We're very pleased."

He said he could not defend the conduct of every trainer but believes the education will be effective in preventing AIDS.

Mr. Sorian said there is no program cost for the "Federal Workplace AIDS Education Initiative" because the training was bankrolled from each department's existing budget for worker education.

Conservative groups have criticized the initiative as "pro-gay."

The Washington Times yesterday published excerpts from government training manuals that tell instructors to break down any resistance to the teaching based on religious beliefs.

The documents portray people opposed to condom distribution in schools as "partisans." They tell teachers to use nonjudgmental words such as "sex partners" instead of "husband and wife," and "injecting drug user" instead of "addict."

Trainer candidates had to discuss their views on "homosexuality for my child" as part of a scoring system to see if they were suitable.

Critics claim the test was designed to exclude all but pro-gay trainers.

Some federal workers—who, for fear of reprisal, spoke only on the condition that they not be identified—complained of being subjected to graphic talk about sex practices.

A Defense Department worker said her class included a slide on "sex toys" and flavored condoms.

A second department employee said he walked out of his session, offended by what he considered a too-intimate discussion for a mixed group.

Another worker said her instructor told participants it was likely that their grandmothers had engaged in anal sex as a form of birth control.

Concerned Women for America, with 600,000 members nationwide, is urging the Republican-controlled Congress to investigate the program.

"This initiative has proved to be little more than a thinly veiled effort at re-educating and reorienting people's views and values," the group said.

Grace Paranzino, a nurse with the U.S. Public Health Service who has conducted federal AIDS training in Pennsylvania, said come trainers do devote too much of the discussion to homosexual sex practices. She said she avoids going over the line.

"We strictly discuss AIDS transmission, prevention and risk reduction as well as federal workplace policy as they relate to HIV

and AIDS," she said. "You must also keep in mind when we talk about HIV and AIDS, it is a sexually transmitted disease, and therefore you cannot ignore it is sexually transmitted."

ABORTION, EUTHANASIA, EMBRYO
EXPERIMENTS ALWAYS IMMORAL
(By Frances D'Emilio)

VATICAN CITY.—Ruling out dissent, Pope John Paul II delivered the Catholic Church's most forceful condemnation of abortion, euthanasia and experimentation on human embryos.

The pope, in an encyclical released today, condemned what he called a spreading "culture of death." He also refined the Church's stand on the death penalty, saying its justification is "very rare," if not "practically non-existent."

Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, the Vatican's guardian of orthodoxy, said the encyclical goes beyond the 1992 revision of the Catechism in hardening the stance against capital punishment.

As for abortion and euthanasia, encyclical is not a pronouncement of new doctrine, because the Church already condemned those practices, Cardinal Alfonso Lopez Trujillo noted, but an important "systematic defense, broader and stronger," of the fundamental right to life.

In "Evangelium vitae," or "Gospel of Life," the 11th encyclical of his 16-year papacy, John Paul also restated the Vatican's ban on birth control. He noted he was well aware of the assertion that "contraception, if made safe and available to all, is the most effective remedy against abortion."

But he said a "contraceptive mentality" could lead to the "temptation" for abortion.

"Indeed, the pro-abortion culture is especially strong precisely where the Church's teaching on contraception is rejected," the pope said, in a possible reference to liberal wings of the Catholic Church, such as in western Europe or in the United States.

John Paul, addressing himself to politicians, declared that abortion and euthanasia are "crimes which no human law can claim to legitimize."

However, he said it was permissible for lawmakers to back legislation allowing abortion under restrictions if the alternative was letting a law stand that was even more liberal.

Cardinal Adam Maida of the Archdiocese of Detroit praised the document and called on U.S. Lawmakers and voters "to work together to develop" legislation with "a new moral conscience."

Opposing abortion is surely the most serious criterion in making political judgments," Maida said.

The pope expressed understanding for women who live through the often "painful and even shattering" experience of abortion. But he said no reason, "however serious and tragic," justifies abortion—including a woman's "desire to protect certain important values such as her own health or a decent standard of living" for the rest of her family.

"I declare that direct abortion, that is, abortion willed as an end or as a means, always constitutes a grave moral disorder since it is the deliberate killing of an innocent human being," the pope wrote in the Church's strongest expression yet on the practice.

He affirmed the Holy See's penalty of automatic excommunication for anyone "who actually procures an abortion."

But he appeared intent on injecting a note of mercy in his overall harsh pronouncement, offering a "special word to women who have had an abortion."

"Certainly what has happened was and remains terribly wrong," the pope wrote. "But do not give in to discouragement and do not lose hope."

He extended "moral condemnation" to "procedures that exploit living human embryos and fetuses—sometimes specifically 'produced' for this purpose by in vitro fertilization—either to be used as 'biological material' or as providers of organs or tissue for transplants in the treatment of certain diseases."

But he did say that prenatal diagnostic techniques, such as amniocentesis, which carry a risk for the fetus or mother, are allowed as medical measures to help the unborn or to allow the mother "a serene and informed acceptance."

The pope reiterated Church teaching that the dying or their families can forego extraordinary measures "when death is clearly imminent and inevitable."

The pope praised movements "in defense of life" that "act resolutely, but without resorting to violence." He did not specifically address the anti-abortion advocates who have killed doctors involved in abortion.

Encyclicals address matters reserved for the most important papal declarations.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PENSION SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as the Speaker knows, I came over to the floor during the course of a previous special order that a number of Members heard, and I had some concerns about the facts that were being discussed about the Federal employee pension system and I therefore want to make some remarks.

Very frankly, those remarks will be in large part from a Congressional Research Service paper that was prepared when the questions raised by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA], the chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee, which he discussed on the floor today, were first raised.

Those two questions include, first, the unfunded liability that is alleged to be present in the Civil Service Retirement System. For those who may not be fully familiar, Federal employees have effectively two retirement systems, one for those employees who were hired prior to January 1, 1984, and those who were hired subsequent to 1984.

The Federal Employee Retirement System, known as FERS, is available to all employees, but is mandatory for those who came on board after January 1, 1984. It is a system that everybody agrees is fully funded. It is a system which for the first time incorporated Social Security within the retirement scheme for Federal employees as well as a thrift savings plan. So the employees since January 1, 1984, essentially have a 3-legged stool as their retirement benefit: the Federal Employment Retirement System itself, the Thrift Savings Plan to which employees and

their employer contribute, and Social Security.

The second question that has been raised was the question: Is the system now insolvent or will it become insolvent in the future? The answer to both these questions is no. That is critically important because that answer leads to the conclusion that there is not the necessity to act precipitously on this issue.

In point of fact, the Republicans are acting precipitously, and notwithstanding the fact that the committee of jurisdiction, the committee formerly known as the Committee on Government Operations, had hearings in subcommittee on this issue, chaired by the gentleman from Florida, and considered a bill, which would have involved a 2½-percent increase in the contribution that Federal employees make to their retirement system. Now that was for both those in the Civil Service Retirement System for employees before January 1, 1984, and those after, even though everyone agrees that those after January 1, 1984, are in a system that is fully paid for, notwithstanding that the proposal is to increase their contribution as well.

For those prior, it is 2½ percent. Ladies and gentlemen, a 2½-percent increase for Federal employees in their contribution is on top of the 7 percent that they already contribute. They do not have Social Security. So this system is their sole retirement system.

Their employer matches their contribution of 7 percent and an additional contribution is made to fully fund the system.

I want to read from the CRS report in answer to those two questions about this system. I am not going to go into the background beyond what I have already stated.

The CRS report says this: "The liabilities of a retirement system are the costs of benefits promised to workers and retirees. A retirement system is fully funded if a trust fund holds assets approximately equal to the present value of all future benefit promises to which retirees and vested employees are entitled." Vesting in the Federal plan, by the way, requires 5 years of employment.

"Unfunded liabilities," the report goes on, "are earned benefits for which assets have not been set aside in a retirement fund. As of the end of fiscal year 1993, the Federal retirement trust fund held \$276.7 billion in assets for the CSRS, or about 34 percent of the long-term CSRS pension liabilities." Thus, the unfunded CSRS liability was \$538.3 billion. That is the sum of which the gentleman from Florida speaks.

Normally one would say that is, and it is, a very large sum. And perhaps we ought to be worried about that. What do the experts say? "The unfunded liability developed because the CSRS funding laws have not required the Government to fund the system fully." That is unlike the private sector, and